

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-16, 19-28 and 30-32 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. Claims 1, 11, 16, 28 have been amended as shown on pages 2-6 of the Reply. The below comments present in greater detail distinctive features of applicants' claimed invention over the cited art that were conveyed to the Examiner over the telephone on January 4, 2008.

Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments and amendments herein.

I. Rejection of Claim 1 Under 35 U.S.C §112

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Withdrawal of this rejection is requested for at least the following reasons.

At page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner contends that the subject claims recite *a computer readable storage medium*, not mentioned in the specification. Applicants' representative avers to the contrary. The specification, at page 6, lines 2-3 recite 'Software components(s) 120 can be any type of classifiable software artifact or persisted data worth keeping tabs on (*e.g.*, file, object, image...)''. Persisted data is data that is stored in a computer readable storage medium. Further, the specification, at page 5, lines 21-24 do describe computer readable media and in particular, computer readable storage media. Thus, the feature *a computer readable storage medium* is taught by the specification. In view of the above, it is requested that this rejection should be withdrawn.

II. Rejection of Claims 1, 3-4, 6-7, 9-12, 14-15, 18, 20-21, 23-28 and 30-32 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claims 1, 3-4, 6-7, 9-12, 14-15, 18, 20-21, 23-28 and 30-32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Gargi, *et al.* (US 20050027712A1). Withdrawal of this rejection is requested for at least the following reasons. The cited reference fails to disclose or suggest all aspects set forth in the subject claims.

A single prior art reference anticipates a patent claim only if it *expressly or inherently describes each and every limitation*

set forth in the patent claim. Trintec Industries, Inc. v. Top-U.S.A. Corp., 295 F.3d 1292, 63 USPQ2d 1597 (Fed. Cir. 2002); *See Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). The **identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim.** *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989) (emphasis added).

The claimed invention relates to a distributed object classification systems and provides a loosely-coupled way for unrelated tools to categorize elements they control according to a common, centrally managed classification scheme. To this end, amended independent claim 1 recites *a computer readable distributed classification system having computer executable components, comprising a plurality of software components shared by unrelated software design tools, stored in a computer readable medium and a classification component that couples the software components to a common classification structure based on a structure type and comprising structure type class, node types and structural constraints, the structural constraints define the permissible parent-child relationship between the various node types.* Independent claims 28 recites *instantiating a common structure based on a structure type, the common structure comprising structure type class, node types and structural constraints, the structural constraints define the permissible parent-child relationship between the various node types; exposing the common structure amongst a plurality of unrelated software design tools to provide a foundation for a cohesive user experience.* Independent claims 11 and 16 recite similar limitations. Gargi *et al.* fails to teach or suggest such novel features recited in the subject claims.

Gargi *et al.* teaches systems and methods for organizing a collection of objects. A given sequence of objects is segmented into object clusters. In accordance with the subject invention, the system allows for unrelated software design tools to classify the elements they control according to a centrally managed classification system. By defining a structure type comprising structure type class, node types and structural constraints, the system allows the unrelated software design tools to classify elements in a consistent manner and store them in an organized hierarchy. This allows different applications to access elements stored in the classified hierarchy. At the cited portions, Gargi *et al.* teaches an object manager that arranges objects into a sequence that is ordered in accordance with context related metadata associated with the object

and automatically segments them into clusters. The context related metadata is then accessed to extract names for the clusters. Then the objects are arranged in a hierarchical structure. Further, at the cited portions, Gargi *et al.* discloses a business process that is modeled as a direct graph having different type of nodes performing an activity. The different processes taught by Gargi *et al.* employ the same method for organizing the collection of objects, but the unrelated processes, namely the media object management system and the business process management system do not access the same objects stored in the same classification structure. The system does not allow unrelated software design tools to classify their objects in the same centrally managed classification system based on a structure type. Thus, Gargi *et al.* is silent regarding *comprising a plurality of software components shared by unrelated software design tools, stored in a computer readable medium and a classification component that couples the software components to a common classification structure based on a structure type and comprising structure type class, node types and structural constraints, the structural constraints define the permissible parent-child relationship between the various node types* as recited by the amended subject claims. Accordingly, it is requested that this rejection with respect to independent claims 1, 11, 16 and 28 (and the claims that depend from) should be withdrawn.

III. Rejection of Claims 5, 8, 13, 19 and 22 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 5, 8, 13, 19 and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Gargi, *et al.* in view of Omoigui, *et al.* (US 2003012636A1). It is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Gargi *et al.* and Omoigui *et al.*, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest all aspects set forth in the subject claims.

Claims 5, 8, 13, 19 and 22 depend from independent claims 1, 11, and 16 respectively. As discussed *supra*, Gargi *et al.* does not disclose all the features of independent claims 1, 11 and 16. Omoigui *et al.* relates to knowledge retrieval, management and presentation of domain specific semantic information and fails to make up for the aforementioned deficiencies of Gargi *et al.* with respect to the independent claims. Thus, applicants' invention as recited in the subject claims is not obvious over the combination of Gargi *et al.* and Omoigui *et al.* Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that this rejection should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments and amendments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063 [MSFTP636US].

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP

/Himanshu S. Amin/

Himanshu S. Amin

Reg. No. 40,894

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP
24TH Floor, National City Center
1900 E. 9TH Street
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
Telephone (216) 696-8730
Facsimile (216) 696-8731